DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 375 706 HE 027 790

AUTHOR Levin, John S.
TITLE Community Colleges as Organizations of Change. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Nov 94
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (19th, Tucson, AZ, November 10-13, 1994).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Administrators; Change Agents; College Faculty; *Community Colleges; Institutional Characteristics; Institutional Mission; Institutional Research; Institutional Role; *Organizational Change; Organizational Objectives; School Community Relationship; Teacher Attitudes; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Arizona; *ASHE Annual Meeting; Cochise College AZ; Pima Community College AZ; Rio Salado Community College AZ; South Mountain Community College AZ; Yavapai College AZ

ABSTRACT

This study examined five community colleges in Arizona to better understand organizational and identity change at a time when community colleges continue to evolve in response to forces and pressures surrounding them. The study used qualitative research through unstructured interviews, questionnaires, and institutional information to explore areas of change including determinants, characteristics, and effects. The investigator met with administrators, faculty, and the chief executive officer at each of the following institutions: Cochise College, South Mountain Community College, Rio Salado Community College, Pima Community College, and Yavapai College. The results indicated that the connection between organizational change and the identity of the community college could be seen as a flowchart of cause and effect, based on the characteristics of the community college as an adaptable and flexible organization, an organization subject to both external and internal forces of change, and heavily relying on executive leadership, external funding agencies, and the external environment. The colleges in this study continue with goals of the past though the approaches to fulfilling purposes and achieving goals have changed and become goals in themselves. They have become more corporate, more managerial, and more biased toward achievement and productivity. (Contains 61 references.) (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 375 706

COMMUNITY COLLEGES AS ORGANIZATIONS OF CHANGE

Dr. John S. Levin
Center for the Study of Higher Education
University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721
jlevin@mail.ed.arizona.edu

HE027 790

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ASHE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ASHE
ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Doubletree Hotel, Tucson, Arizona, November 10-13, 1994. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

COMMUNITY COLLEGES AS ORGANIZATIONS OF CHANGE

Dr. John S. Levin
Center for the Study of Higher Education
University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721
jlevin@mail.ed.arizona.edu

Over the past two decades, community colleges have experienced considerable organizational change. While they continue to possess characteristics which gave them a unique identity as organizations in the 1960s and 1970s, the consequences of organizational change have altered these institutions. Although they continue to be teaching institutions (Cohen, 1977; Dennison, 1994b), community colleges in facing forces of change over the past two decades have developed beyond the descriptions which characterized them in the past. They are not simply open door colleges, or comprehensive postsecondary institutions, or second chance or even second best schools. Their identity as organizations is complex, incorporating their history, their ideologies, and their behaviors. In the 1990s, these institutions while maintaining many of the attributes which characterized them in the past have acquired new attributes and modified or replaced former ones.

Community colleges are subject to a barrage of external forces and expectations, such as social expectations to provide open access to postsecondary education, shifts in the economy, demands from employers for trained employees, and community needs for social and economic development. In a national Canadian study (Dennison and Levin, 1989), as a co-investigator, I noted that numerous external forces had affected Canadian community colleges in the 1980s, including the economy, provincial governments and their policies and practices, and changing student characteristics. In that study, community colleges were primarily influenced in their behaviors and actions by external forces of change. As a consequence of these forces, community colleges were viewed as less locally oriented, more controlled by provincial governments, and undergoing significant alterations in areas such as educational programming, employee relations, and governance.

In this present study of Arizona community colleges, similar dramatic organizational change is in progress in the 1990s. As a consequence of both external and internal forces of change, these community colleges have altered identities as institutions. While they continue to emphasize their teaching function and unlike the Canadian community college they continue to have a local orientation, Arizona community colleges have developed into more sophisticated and professional institutions, diplomatically directed by chief executive officers and executive level administrators. They have become more business-like in their approaches to operational functioning. They resort to the practices of strategic planning, total quality management, and rational systems in such areas as programming and scheduling. They depend upon, more than previously, a formal bureaucratic organization, for example in the development and establishment of policies to guide behaviors, to ensure consistency and control. They are more internally communicative, using newsletters and meetings where college officials address college issues and employee concerns. They are more productive, enlarging their activities and acquiring more resources while using them

more efficiently to respond to the needs and demands of their expanding clientele. Their students have become more diverse, more heterogeneous in backgrounds and in needs, both personal and educational, and more numerous.

The community colleges of Arizona have grown both in enrollments and in productivity; they have both aged and matured. Their employees are older, both administrators and faculty. They have developed more sophisticated ways of doing business, such as telephone registration, instruction through telecommunications, governance through elaborate committee structures, resource acquisition through contracts with business and industry both locally and internationally, and adherence to social policy through the establishment of special offices and initiatives (e.g., employment equity).

Background for this Study: The Identity of the Community College

Community colleges have been the subject of considerable discussion and debate by scholars and practitioners about their identity as organizations. This discourse on identity includes the purposes and goals of community colleges, their social functions, and their role as educational institutions. A prominent identity of the community college is self-defined, both asserted by and derived from community college practitioners. Scholars and observers, too, offer definitions of this institution. The community college is characterized as an institution responsive to community needs (Richardson Jr., Fisk, and Okum, 1983; Levin and Dennison, 1989). To some, the community college is a social welfare agency (Richardson Jr. and Bender, 1987); to others, it is a democratizing agent (Dennison and Gallagher, 1986). It is also characterized as an innovative institution with visionary leaders (Gleazer Jr., 1980; Roueche, Baker III, and Rose, 1989). Additionally, the community college is saddled with the label "all things to all people" (Cohen and Brawer, 1982). In short, the identity of the community college approaches the image of an educational smorgasbord:

> They have viewed themselves, and have been conceived by their major constituencies, as comprehensive institutions performing a variety of functions--remediation, community service, economic development, job training, career preparation, and transfer among others. (McGrath and Spear, 1991, p. 9)

Prescribed identities for the community college, in addition to the many descriptions, are prolific. These include their role as adaptable and flexible social organizations and their role as enhancing upward economic and social mobility for their students. The literature on community colleges from the 1960s (e.g., Medsker, 1960) to the 1980s (e.g., Cohen and Brawer, 1982; Tillery and Deegan, 1985; Brint and Karabel, 1989), as diverse in philosophical underpinnings as it may be, has no trouble with consensus upon the issue of the mission of community colleges to effect change. For some, it has failed its mission; for others, it has succeeded beyond expectation.

In the late 1980s and 1990s, this proclaimed role as change agent has not diminished, and community colleges continue to articulate missions which reflect their predisposition toward social change and organizational responsiveness. On one side of the argument, critics claim that community colleges are socially immature,

marginalized institutions (Kempner, 1991) or socially reproductive (Brint and Karabel, 1989): that is, they do not effect deep structural social change; they only perpetuate the social status quo. These critics, however, do not question the ascribed and proclaimed mission of community colleges as organizations of change.

With these organizational characteristics--adaptable and flexible, agents of social change--it should not be surprising to consider community colleges as subject to considerable organizational change and as heavily involved in social change. Community colleges are characterized both as organizations undergoing change and organizations influencing change.

Recent studies and scholarly discussions (Richardson Jr. and Bender, 1987; Dennison and Levin, 1989; McGrath and Spear, 1991; Deegan, 1992; Roueche and Roueche, 1993; Dennison, 1994) have focused not on the influence of the community college upon external environments--as organizations influencing change--but rather upon community colleges as institutions influenced by their external environments--as institutions undergoing change. Community colleges are subject to both external and internal forces of change. They have, since the 1980s in particular, experienced considerable organizational change. Deegan (1992) identifies a decline in staff morale, administrator and faculty burnout, and hostile faculty-administration relationships as consequences of forces of change, which include inadequate resources and excessive evaluation by both internal and external evaluators. Richardson Jr. and Bender (1987) note that community colleges, especially urban colleges, have altered their mission from an educational one to a social welfare one. It is argued that community colleges have compromised their standards (Richardson Jr. and Bender, 1987) in order to cope with their new clientele: those who are "less well prepared than their predecessors and more likely to be members of a minority group" (p. 117). McGrath and Spear (1991) point out several dramatic changes to the community college including no less than a transformation of academic culture brought about by changing student demography (the dominance of the non-traditional student) and institutional responsiveness to these non-traditional students. Institutional response included emphasis upon remediation, then upon developmental education, and finally upon a disordered or ambiguous curriculum (McGrath and Spear, 1991), one which blended personal and cognitive goals and weakened the academic, disciplined-based curriculum. In this new environment, education at the community college meant mechanical skills activities, information retrieval, and affective development of individual students (McGrath and Spear, 1991). Finally, Roueche and Roueche (1993) note that community colleges are giving serious and sophisticated attention to "at-risk" students by using effective strategies to fit the needs of these students. Successful endeavors by colleges have sought a balance between open access and actual opportunity---that is, between a student's right to choose a program of study and a college's obligation to influence or determine that choice. The condition of the "at-risk" student arises as a consequence of changing demographics, increasing demands of expanding technology, and the poor performance of public education (Roueche and Roueche, 1993). The practices of the past in the community college, where student choice took precedence, are not seen as sufficient responses to these "at-risk" students; and, thus, new strategies and approaches are utilized to improve student performance (Roueche and Roueche, 1993).

The examination of the community college from the perspective of external influences prevails as the dominant way to understand organizational change. With the exception of a few ethnographic case studies (e.g., Cooper and Kempner, 1991; Owen, 1992; Levin, 1993), there is little examination of organizational change in the community college brought about primarily as a consequence of internal forces. The ethnographic studies noted above suggest that administrative leadership, particularly presidential succession, is the major force underlying organizational change. And, change in these studies is a result of a contest or conflict between two or more ideologies or cultures. The overwhelming majority of studies on the community college in the 1980s and 1990s indicate that organizational change in the community college is brought about by external forces of change, such as changing demographics (e.g., increase in under prepared students), government initiatives (e.g., skills development programs), the economy (e.g., unemployment), or technology (e.g., computerization of vocational/occupational fields).

A Study of Forces of Change Acting Upon the Community College

A number of questions arise from an examination of the literature on the community college if this investigation is to provide a current conceptualization of the character or identity of the community college. What are the forces of change acting upon the community college? What are the determinants and effects of organizational change in the community college? Specifically, to what extent are community colleges as organizations of change influenced or directed by internal forces of change? What or who are these internal forces of change? And, finally, how and to what extent have these external and internal forces of change contributed to or altered the identity of the community college in such areas as purposes and goals, social functions, and their role as educational institutions?

This study makes one step in addressing the research questions. The investigation is an examination of five community colleges in the state of Arizona, conducted in 1993 and 1994, through the use of qualitative research methods along the lines suggested by Merriam (1988) and Yin (1989) for case study research and Burgess (1984) for field research. The investigation employs unstructured interviews, questionnaires, and institutional information to explore areas of organizational change, including determinants, characteristics, and effects. The colleges chosen were identified by key observers as institutions involved in organizational change. One was described as an innovative institution; another as a socially responsive institution; and another as a multi-campus institution moving from a centralized system of management to a de-centralized one. Furthermore, all colleges had recently experienced presidential succession.

Over a six month period, the investigator met with administrators and faculty, as well as the chief executive officer, at each community college. Interviews were extended conversations covering topics of institutional history and organizational change. Interview data were developed by the investigator into reports on each college. These reports constituted profiles of the colleges and identified the characteristics, prominent historical events, and current issues of each college from the perspective of organizational participants. Questionnaires were distributed to college personnel, asking respondents to identify changes, forces of change, and outcomes of change in fourteen

categories (e.g., curriculum, personnel, finances, students, governance). These personnel included the following: board members, chief executive officer, educational administrators, other senior administrators, faculty in leadership roles (e.g., department chairs), and support staff in leadership roles (e.g., chair of staff association). Institutional documents (e.g., enrollments, budgets) were examined to identify patterns of change based upon quantitative data. Institutional information included college catalogues, promotional material, college budget documents, college newsletters, college statistical information (e.g., student numbers, faculty inventory), and state board documents on enrollments, programming, and budgets. Interview data, questionnaire data, and institutional information derived from documents were analyzed both individually and comparatively. Organizational change both to individual institutions and to the community colleges as a whole were identified, as were determinants and consequences of change.

Findings

In this report, organizational changes, their determinants and consequences, are confined primarily to the period of 1990 to 1994, although determinants do pre-date 1990 in some examples. Findings are presented where possible in the words of organizational participants, and direct quotations are used to provide a sense of their perceptions.

Two categories of findings emerged in this investigation. The first category pertains to specific areas of change such as students and finances where determinants were in the form of facts (e.g., increase in student numbers over a five year period and changed characteristics of students; financial support from the state diminished or did not grow proportionately with growth in services required). The outcomes or consequences of change were also presented or articulated as factual, or at least lacking in complexity of interpretation (e.g., more emphasis in programming on academic and university transfer education, more efforts to acquire financial resources through grants, partnerships with business and industry, and a management emphasis on efficiency to reduce costs and maximize expenditures). These forces of change were predominantly external ones, and community colleges were obliged to react and to adapt. In addition, social expectations of accountability for community colleges were treated as a fact, and accreditation processes and institutional evaluation were seen as givens, justifying institutional efforts for self-examination and self-measurement.

Cochise College noted a pronounced increase in student demand with a stable or static budget (even shrinking in some areas). The organizational behavior was described as "serving more with less". The requirement of "greater efficiencies" resulted in more part-time faculty, less service to students, and organizational changes in structure and process. "Downsizing" in some areas, shifting resources from one area to another, and greater control by administrators over spending were effects of increased student demand and static budgets. Moreover, "personnel unrest" and "distrust" were also viewed as effects.

At South Mountain Community College, significant change in the characteristics of students was highlighted. Current students possessed different career goals than their predecessors. Enrollment patterns emphasized university transfer courses. These students comprised a larger proportion of "Anglos", and made a "minority dominated" campus more diverse. This group included more high school completers and younger

students than in the past. Change in community demographics and a wider college catchment area were noted as the determinants of the change in student characteristics. The effects of this change included curricular and instructional changes. Increases in offerings and student numbers in Mathematics and Science were noted as strong evidence of changing student behaviors. The claim was that the college "has moved away from remediation" as a dominant instructional emphasis.

At Rio Salado Community College, restricted financial resources and financial limitations on operations gave rise to a more "streamlined organization", and to greater "efficiency and effectiveness" in delivery of services. Actions precipitated by these conditions included reallocation of resources, change in focus of curriculum from courses to programs, decreases in administrative personnel, a re-organization of administration, the introduction of Total Quality Management philosophy and practices in all areas including teaching as well as administration, and greater emphasis upon collaboration externally and internally, with increased participation by organizational members in college operations.

At Pima Community College, program evaluation was cited as a major change to college behaviors. Determinants of the introduction of program evaluation included external concern and scrutiny over quality, including accreditation agency recommendations to focus upon assessment issues, and program rationalization, suggesting the need to eliminate what was referred to as unproductive programs. As well, in meeting the perceived needs of the local community as well as its goals of improving its multi-cultural environment, the college added new courses and programs. Furthermore, program evaluation was a part of rationalization of the organization of educational services and the management of the institution. Effects included the establishment of a student outcomes assessment program, a reported decrease in faculty control over curriculum, and instruction oriented toward outcomes measures.

The second category of findings pertains to the thematic content of responses made by organizational participants, most prevalent in interviews. These themes served as both a structuring device for discussions by institutional participants as well as a sense-making device for their observations about organizational change. These themes included the topic of the organizational past versus the present, new presidential leadership, management strategies and tactics for coping with change or for organizational improvements, and the special or unique qualities, characteristics, and history of each individual community college. For example, management strategies to improve organizational functioning included the use of Total Quality Management (TQM) or of a Quality Improvement program, re-configuration and re-organization of structure (e.g., from centralized to de-centralized) or organizational units, and shifts in institutional authority (e.g., role of faculty in governance). While all colleges used students or community as justifications for managerial initiatives and changes, other rationales complemented these actions (e.g., replace ineffective and unwanted administrators through re-organization, develop a new clientele, promote image as an effective institution, and secure greater managerial control over programming and instruction).

A pertinent example of the pervasive theme of the organizational past compared to the present can be found in the data from Pima Community College. The past is described as fraught with problems, from the "firing" of presidents (3), to the interference of

boards in administration, to the use of board members by faculty for influence over institutional actions, to the "atmosphere of brutal competition" and hostility between campuses (campus versus campus is described as a "war"), and between administrators and faculty and between campuses and central office. These were seen as the "depths of bad times", from the mid-1970s to 1990, prior to the arrival of a new chief executive officer in 1990.

The issue of the college "on probation" in the 1980s from the North Central accreditation body was described alternatively as the "darkest days", a "blow to everyone", as a public embarrassment to the "best thing that ever happened to us". Particular reference was made to "the board from hell", a board which was the product of disaffected faculty's efforts to influence the president. The faculty campaigned in local elections and helped board members "gain power". This board was "unmanageable", "intruded in the institution", and "caused havoc". Eventually, the board was "forced out by state intervention". As a consequence of this, the college hit "rock bottom" and was forced to examine itself, characterized by analogy to an individual with an "alcohol problem". The "board from hell" showed what could happen in a "disorganized college" where there was a history of "faculty trying to circumvent administration".

This event "woke up the community to the importance of the college". The university had "hoped we'd go away" for years. But the conditions of embarrassment and the probationary status of the college permitted the arrival from another jurisdiction of an experienced and respected chief executive officer. Leadership succession was viewed as a major "cultural change": "this is a different place", where there is a perceived change in institutional climate, where the level of trust has risen, where there are now clear lines of responsibility, openness, and where people "believe in...[equal or equity opportunities]". The "horrors" of the past have "now broken down", and the chief executive officer "has command of the situation". Now the college is characterized as a professional institution, indeed as a new institution.

Two other findings from the investigation of all five colleges emerged which apply as much to the respondents themselves as to the relationship of the content of their responses to organizational change. First, the role, actions, and personality of the chief executive officer--both former chief executive officers and present ones--were dominant features of all discussions, including those with the chief executive officer. The role of the chief executive officer in initiating change was regarded as "central", "crucial", and "essential".

Yavapai College provides a salient example of the prominence of the chief executive officer. The arrival of a new president in July 1993 brought a sense of hope, relief, and fairly high expectations to the college. The presidency of the most recent president, lasting some eight years, concluded in 1992 to the relief of the majority of college members. This president was described as an autocratic president who did contribute to the college through facilities development (e.g., campus building and performing arts center). His legacy is present, however, in the expressions of bitterness about the past and the treatment of faculty ("the past was so bad"). A faculty vote of non-confidence in the president, as well as a faculty petition to the state board of governors, initiated the departure of the president.

The departure of the president has ushered in a developmental period for the college, what faculty refer to as "the new democracy". An institutional self-study is in progress in preparation for accreditation. The president sees this process as a form of strategic

planning ("but I can't use those words", because of their past connotations), and the faculty see it as an "avenue of change" ("not an event but a process"). The new president is viewed as a symbol of hope at the college and is compared to the former president who was a symbol of despair. There are, nonetheless, strong feelings about the past president, some of these include reverence for the president for past accomplishments.

In the final grouping of findings, the level of agreement among respondents in identifying, explaining, and evaluating broad institutional phenomena (e.g., presidential actions, organizational history, and present institutional initiatives such as TQM) was high, almost unanimous. This conformity matches the assertions of McGrath and Spear (1991) about the near-obsession at the community college with the pursuit of commonality, noted among faculty in particular. The marginal voices who opposed or disagreed with the overwhelming majority of respondents were highlighted by their scarcity. However, the content of their messages was condemnation of that which was lauded by the majority. For example, at one college where a former chief executive officer was consistently criticized by college respondents, including the current president, faculty leaders, and administrators who had worked with that president, the former secretary to that president who spoke in private and guardedly to the investigator, noted that there was a conspiracy by administrators and faculty to discredit and then oust the former president. Contrary to the majority of responses from this college, the former secretary articulated considerable respect for the vilified chief executive officer. At another community college, one lone faculty member condemned administrative practices as altering roles and responsibilities so that faculty were diminished in their program roles in order to alter college purposes: "The populist vision of community colleges is lost and the business model has been adopted" (College faculty respondent). Such voices were singular in their critiques.

Organizational Change at Five Arizona Community Colleges

Each college was undergoing organizational change with distinct behaviors and actions characterizing organizational identity.

Cochise College

Although conflict and politics are described as a way of life for all at Cochise College, the college is now experiencing its greatest period of change. Cochise College is a highly political environment, particularly observable in "administrative in-fighting", "campus rivalry", as well as in personal animosities among campus employees. During the period of this study, a Vice-President resigned, and behaviors preceding this event suggested considerable conflict between organizational factions. Personal politics are a dominating presence at Cochise College.

The college operates within a dual campus structure. While this dual campus model is a major determinant of operations and has led to significant conflicts within the institution, there is neither plan nor action to address the structural flaws. As noted by numerous organizational participants, the dual campus model is a significant component of "organizational culture".

While there is apparent stasis in the external environment at one campus, at the other the college is constantly affected by the community and the adjacent military facility. Changes in the military population have a direct bearing upon Cochise College. However, according to college administrators, without additional funding for the college--required as a consequence of changes in the state funding formula which disadvantages Cochise--the college may not be able to meet community demands. Enrolment may be managed so that access is limited. If this action is to occur, according to college members, the effects will be "major". Yet no planning or groundwork is mentioned by organizational participants to address consequences of enrolment limitations.

Change is viewed as a positive possibility as the college has been fairly static for almost a decade. According to both faculty and administrators, change may also improve morale and relationships, particularly if the president is successful in replacing administrators. New ventures, stimulated by the North American Free Trade Agreement (Nafta), with Mexican colleges have led to increased activity in programming--for example, seminars for businesses and the development of an international language institute in Mexico, jointly sponsored by colleges in Mexico and Cochise College. The college has recently initiated a strategic planning process, and has called for substantial employee involvement in charting new directions. While this is a major sign of change in the college, the outcomes of strategic planning have yet to be realized.

Recent presidential succession has signaled the greatest potential for change. The ability of the president to handle a "political board" is seen by administrators as a potential for change. Yet the administrators do not see their work or themselves as supported by this president, who was formerly a senior administrator at the college.

The college is a relatively small institution, and thus it has avoided excessive growth and dramatic change. The college can continue to be, according to college members, an informal environment and "people can still know everyone".

Pima Community College

At Pima Community College, there is a strong sense of a new or changed college (from the 1980s and before), but the change is seen and described as predominantly structural--in organization of campuses/district (Pima is a multi-campus college occupying a large urban district), in administrative structure (e.g., provosts as campus heads)--and in image--as a more professional (looking) institution. New does not mean that faculty have changed their values or behaviors.

The arrival and the work of the new chief executive officer is linked to the college "crisis" of the 1980s. The 1970s for the college were described as a period where the college was saddled with a poor public image, possessing "second class status" in comparison to the local university. The 1980s were characterized as "the darkest days", "the depths of bad times" where administrative behaviors and the actions of the governing board led to a dysfunctional institution, culminating in the removal of board members by state government intervention. The arrival of the new chief executive officer, the re-organization of the college, and major changes initiated by the chief executive officer to college operations signaled "hope" and a sense of "optimism" for college members.

The past of Pima Community College is described as "dark" and "dismal", particularly in organizational functioning. This situation has markedly improved, and the perception is that the college is functioning well, with such features as program review, faculty evaluation, departmental chairs re-definition, decision approval processes, and accountability systems instituted. The role of the campus, the roles of the campus heads (provosts), and the role of the central college administration have been clarified.

The turn-around of Pima suggests organizational transformation, where fundamental change has occurred. Behavioral change (e.g., people's treatment of each other has reportedly improved), organizational systems change, efficiency improvements, educational improvements, and mission changes all suggest that a change in organizational culture is in progress. The college has altered its focus to emphasize students and education, lessened its focus upon politics and campus "wars". Its morale has reportedly improved and its image has greater public approval.

There is some disagreement on the outcomes of change at Pima. While all agree that the mission has changed and the operations have altered, one faculty member sees that there is but "lip service" to multiculturalism and minorities--the resources are not directed towards these areas. Several faculty leaders noted that resources are going to buildings, to "empire building", and to administration. Energies are focused upon city development, and contracts for service are "farmed out", according to faculty leaders.

There is some disagreement among faculty leaders and senior administrators about the primary goals of the college. One faculty member expressed the goals of the college as to "serve the underserved"; another said that service to the underserved was just a part of the overall goals of the college. There was, however, agreement among faculty leaders on the use of part-time faculty. They were described as an "underclass". According to faculty, while change to their condition was in progress such change has not materialized.

Major changes over the past three years have taken considerable work. This work seems to have been carried out by administrators, who, from available evidence, are overworked. Recent alterations to departmental organization and the reduction of academic departments from some 75 in number to approximately 40 were initiated by an accreditation agency's recommendations. However, considerable resistance within the institution to the administratively led alteration and reduction was mounted by faculty. The change process was protracted and required negotiation and diplomacy on the part of all parties, particularly on the part of the chief executive officer.

The college is kept attentive and responsive by its sense of the past "crisis" or its need to improve upon a "dismal" past. With this dominating, negative image of the past, the college chief executive officer is able to repair the damage caused by the failures of the past and affect change in organizational culture. This change is most prevalent in college operations which have a professional and sophisticated image and in college functioning which has increased in efficiency.

Rio Salado Community College

College participants characterize and describe their institution as an "innovative change agent". The untraditional, entrepreneurial character of the college is the basic rationale for its existence. It has many of the characteristics of a private business. It

appears to thrive on challenge and change. This college appears to function outside of traditional academic forms--no real faculty body, no campuses, no academic departments, and no student body *per se*. At least a dozen managers and faculty at Rio Salado Community College justify the non-traditional form of the college and indicate, that by any measure, Rio Salado is a "truly successful" community college.

The sense of difference articulated by Rio Salado faculty and administrators also includes feelings of "threat" and a perceived "sense of enmity" directed towards Rio Salado by other district county colleges. The president articulates their vulnerability. But she also explains that while enrolment dropped this year at all other district colleges, they rose significantly at Rio Salado. As well, Rio Salado had "invaded others' territory", and is not perceived by faculty at other colleges, according to Rio Salado organizational members, to function like a "real college" with a campus. Recently, Rio Salado won a state award for quality service. This, too, breeds enmity among other district colleges toward Rio Salado.

The orientation toward change may be clearly seen in the lack of permanent facilities, the lack of traditional forms (e.g., academic departments), perceived lack of bureaucracy, and lack of a faculty body. These are some of the characteristics which the president notes as part of the "college of the future". External observers see the college as the "R and D" (research and development) center for the district, where innovations are researched, developed, and tried out, then borrowed by another community college. A business program head exclaimed, "what's a regular program?". "We live on the edge of the paradigm", noted one manager. The organization of Rio Salado reflects its difference, with few administrative levels and with departments named "corporate education and training", and programs such as "the quality academy". By most criteria, the college is "non-traditional".

The permanent employees note that the college is a "great place to work". It "gives you a chance to be creative". Indeed, several employees praised the college as a workplace. A good reason for this is the innovative, entrepreneurial approach. Another is that "women have greater freedom in this environment"--where there are a majority of women as full time employees. The women are teachers, administrators, managers, and the president. And, this environment is different than one where there are women in leadership roles. Here, according to organizational members, women's approaches--co-operation, listening, supporting, integrating--are the norm. Strong feelings of loyalty and admiration for the president were evident. The presence and perhaps the dominance of women, particularly in leadership roles at Rio Salado, appear to create or help establish a strong internal community.

Little or no self-criticism is evident in the institution. There is conformity in thought about the purpose and practices of the institution. This commonality of organizational ideology seems to further the mission and performance of the college. It has embraced Total Quality Management not only as a tool but also as a philosophy.

The college is devoted to adaptation, to coping with and thriving on external change. Its mission and its rationale for existence hinge upon its organizational flexibility, on its ability to respond to external demands and needs. Organizational change is a part of its character and a way of institutional life for its members.

South Mountain Community College

There are divergent views about organizational change at South Mountain Community College. One the one hand the senior college administrators suggest that change is closely connected to their arrival at the college. On the other hand, faculty leaders place more emphasis upon changing student behaviors as major precipitators of change.

The president and two deans work as an integrated and intimate "team". They all arrived together a year earlier at South Mountain as a former administrative group from another community college in the same district, where the president was the chief executive officer for eight years. They work together, experiencing the "enthusiasm, depression, and confidence aspects of their work together". They talk to each other constantly, discussing multiple issues such as a teacher's performance, budgets, students, and "new ideas". Their offices are located in the same building, on the same floor, within close proximity of each other.

From their perspective, the arrival of the three senior administrators marked a major change for South Mountain Community College. The former president, characterized as autocratic, paternalistic, "old style", was the founding president (1980) of South Mountain. The loss of the "patriarch" was viewed as a loss to the majority of college members--they were used to his style and the habits they acquired to deal with the president. According to these senior administrators, the faculty, in particular, were "anxious about the arrival of the new president and his team". They noted that the faculty are "overwhelmed" with imposed change, as are other administrators and support staff. For example, the president has introduced a participatory style of management and governance into the institution, ensuring the involvement of employees in college decision-making. Faculty, according to the three senior administrators, however, have some anxiety over this new approach to governance and management.

According to faculty leaders, the faculty embrace their institution's character as a diverse institution serving the underprivileged as their primary mission. They see themselves as adaptable and innovative, a consequence of their mission. While they articulate their orientation to change, they are unwilling to alter their core values--diversity for students, faculty, staff, and administration; student learning; and a small, human, personable environment. They are viewed by observers at other colleges, according to South Mountain faculty, as "anti-establishment", "non-traditional", and "weird". The faculty at South Mountain enjoy this imposed role.

They see change as slowly developing as they grow in size and as their needs increase, especially the need for more full time faculty to staff their programs. Major change has been precipitated primarily as a consequence of changing student characteristics. But, faculty do not see that the new management group has altered the institution. Instead, they see the new president as adapting. While they agree that the faculty role as a group or collective, as opposed to individual roles, is more prominent than in the past and that faculty are asked to participate in governance, the faculty see that the freedoms of the past have both merit and benefit.

The discrepancies between the perceptions of faculty leaders and senior administration reflect a difference not only between the old and new organizational members but also between interpretations of the purpose and dynamics of change. For the senior

administrators, change at South Mountain means the establishment of contemporary management and organizational practices, the introduction of rational systems and rational planning, which were processes absent in the past. These processes and systems will assist the college in adaptation and in coping with external forces of change. For the faculty leaders, change focuses upon their work with students, upon "making a difference" in individual lives. This change is precipitated by a number of factors including institutional growth, student demographics, and the nature of the community which is "undereducated and underemployed". While the faculty see innovation as coping with student needs, which is a positive act, they abhor change which may threaten the values they hold about their institution as a "caring", "personal", and "diverse" environment.

Yavapai College

At Yavapai College, change is directed toward institutional health and morale improvement. With a "traumatic" past, including a faculty-administrative conflict lasting for several years and the eventual departure of the president, the college was propelled away from the past both with the arrival of a new president (from the outside) and with the initiation of an institutional self-study. The arrival of the new president and the self-study process not only set the stage for change but also brought forward and made manifest institutional values and placed "organizational culture" at the forefront of everyone's attention. "Organizational culture" or "college environment" was referred to frequently by organizational members.

For Yavapai College, the external environment is more static than dynamic, with change occurring in such areas as student demographics at a slow rate. This condition, therefore, has permitted considerable time for review and reflection on the part of organizational participants, enabling internal change to be a more deliberate process. Governance, for example, as a philosophy and as a process, was at the forefront of attention for college members.

The new president during a one year period precipitated change in administrative personnel, replacing administrators and altering management of the organization. Furthermore, as a dual campus model, Yavapai possesses two rather distinct organizational environments. The operational separation of the two sites, historically encouraged, faces pressure for change. As well, issues such as faculty development, a large complement of part-time faculty, and new administrative personnel and processes suggest that the college is facing considerable change.

Conclusions

The connection between organizational change and the identity of the community college can be viewed in this investigation as a flowchart of cause and effect, based upon the characteristics of the community college as an adaptable and flexible organization, an organization subject to both external and internal forces of change, and heavily reliant upon such factors as executive leadership, external funding agencies, and the dynamics of the external environment (e.g., changing clienteles, the economy, and social expectations and values such as the issue of the accountability of educational institutions to the public). Major organizational change in the community college, such

as presidential succession, re-organization or re-configuration of structure, programming and resource acquisition initiatives, is initially a product--a response to external forces of change or internal conditions. Subsequently, the organizational response stimulates other internal changes. These major organizational changes which are outcomes of organizational responses to both external forces and internal conditions are likely the main contributors of an altered identity of the community college. Community colleges are not so much institutions effecting external change (e.g., social change), as articulated in their mission, as they are institutions affected by both external events and forces of change, as well as by internal events and conditions. The behaviors of former chief executive officers and of former college governing boards in two of these colleges initiated significant organizational change as reactions to these parties. The perceived or actual limitations or changes in funding from external sources significantly affected the operations of another college, leading to college re-organization and re-structuring as well as to the introduction of a new organizational philosophy. The arrival of a new group of senior administrators at one college led to alteration in college formal practices. And, at two colleges, the changing characteristics of students altered programming, instruction, and in the case of one of these colleges placed severe stress on budgets.

In the 1990s, community colleges as organizations have borne the consequences of both growth and efforts to change internally to encourage growth. These growth related actions were precipitated as early as the late 1970s (see Richardson Jr. et. al, 1983 and McGrath and Spear, 1991). These were reported as developments initiated and steered by college administrators. Others suggest that actions precipitating growth of the community college may be a consequence of government policy and behaviors (Levin, 1994) or autonomous acting government officials (Dougherty, 1988). In this investigation, the concerns of the community colleges about public image, financial stability and resource acquisition, as well as the organizational goal of growth and internal order (e.g., stable employee relations, functioning systems), have led to both leadership succession and new management approaches.

In Arizona, the community college has gained a more sophisticated identity; it behaves either more professionally or more business-like both in its pursuit of mission and in its daily operations. This new identity of the community college emanates from the organizational apex of control--at the executive and presidential level of the institution. Old style bosses and blatantly autocratic chief executive officers of the past have been succeeded by diplomatic, strategically minded leaders. It should not be surprising that two of the five recent chief executive officers are women, and women are well-represented in the administration of these colleges. Additionally, in their administrative personnel, two of these colleges reflect the ethnically diverse communities they serve. Change in personnel, then, has gone hand in hand with significant organizational change.

While the community colleges in this investigation may continue to articulate purposes, goals, and functions which are comparable to those of the past, they have altered in both their emphasis and in their approaches. The purpose of providing educational services to the community continues to apply to these institutions. The goals of access to postsecondary education, community service, and basic education for all in need have been maintained. Approaches to fulfilling purposes and achieving goals in these institutions have, however, altered and may have become purposes and

goals in themselves. In adapting to external change, in coping with external forces of change, and in responding to external demands, community colleges are no longer primarily teaching institutions (Cohen, 1977; Dennison, 1994b) and they are not simple educational institutions in the mold of the junior college prior to the 1970s or even the same institution as referred to by Cross (1985) in a discussion of community college missions and priorities.

They have become more corporate, more managerial, more controlled by rational systems (Raisman, 1990) in order to expand their mission and develop and fulfill their goals. They are more likely to be imitators of organizations praised in popular business literature: as organizations with a bias for action and with emphasis upon productivity and achievement. Such an emphasis requires considerable organizational sophistication and considerable marketing. They are less likely to emulate the practices of the university which according to one scholar lacks business-like qualities and is poorly managed (Keller, 1983). They are also less likely to mirror the ideals and behaviors of the university which include, among others, collegiality, tenure, the pursuit of knowledge. As Levy and Merry (1986) note, organizations possess perspectives for posing and solving problems, believing what is real, determining what problems to pursue and goals to serve, and accepting approaches and solutions that give overall meaning to actions. The perspective of the community college has altered and so too have its behaviors and actions, and ultimately its identity.

REFERENCES

Beckhard, Richard, and Wendy Pritchard. 1992. **Changing the Essence: The Art of Creating and Leading Fundamental Change in Organizations**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bensimon, Estella, Anna Neumann, and Robert Birnbaum. 1989. **Making Sense of Administrative Leadership**. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University.

Bergquist, William. 1992. **The Four Cultures of the Academy**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Birnbaum, Robert. 1988. **How Colleges Work**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Birnbaum, Robert. 1992. **How Academic Leadership Works**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bacharach, Samuel, and Edward Lawler. 1980. **Power and Politics in Organizations**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bolman, Lee, and Terence Deal. 1991. **Reframing Organizations**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Brint, Steven, and Jerome Karabel. 1989. **The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America, 1900-1985**. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bryson, John. 1991. **Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organizations**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Burgess, Robert. 1984. **In the Field: An Introduction to Field Research**. Boston: George Allen & Unwin.

Cameron, Kim. 1984. "Organizational Adaptation and Higher Education." **Journal of Higher Education** , 55(2), 122-144.

Cameron, Kim, and Deborah Ettington. 1988. "The Conceptual Foundations of Organizational Culture." In John Smart (ed.), **Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research**. New York: Agathon Press.

Chaffee, Ellen, and William Tierney. 1988. **Collegiate Culture and Leadership Strategies**. New York: American Council on Education and MacMillan Publishing Company.

Cohen, Arthur. 1977. "The Social Equalization Fantasy." **Community College Review**, 15 (2), 74-82.

Cohen, Arthur, and Florence Brawer. 1982. **The American Community College**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Cooper, Joanne, and Ken Kempner. 1991. "Lord of the Flies Community College." Unpublished paper, presented at the annual meeting of ASHE, Boston.

Cross, K. Patricia. 1985. "Determining Missions and Priorities for the Fifth Generation." In William Deegan, Dale Tillery and Associates (eds.), **Renewing the American Community College**, pp. 34-50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Deegan, William. 1992. "Proven Techniques: The Use and Impact of Major Management Concepts in Community Colleges." **AACJC Journal** (April/May): 26-30.

Deegan, William, Dale Tillery, and Rudy Melone. 1985. "The Process of Renewal: An Agenda for Action." In William Deegan, Dale Tillery, and Associates (eds.), **Renewing the American Community College**, pp. 303-324. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Dennison, John, ed. 1994. **Canada's Community Colleges in the Third Millennium**. Vancouver, B.C.: University of British Columbia Press.

Dennison, John. 1994b. "Conclusion." In John Dennison (ed.), **Canada's Community Colleges in the Third Millennium**. Vancouver, B.C.: University of British Columbia Press.

Dennison, John, and John Levin. 1989. **Canada's Community Colleges in the Nineteen Eighties**. Willowdale, Ontario: Association of Canadian Community Colleges.

Doughtery, Kevin. 1988. "The Politics of Community College Expansion." **American Journal of Education**, May 1988, 351-393.

Fryer, Jr., Thomas, and John Lovas. 1991. **Leadership in Governance**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hasenfeld, Yeheskel. 1983. **Human Service Organizations**. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Keller, George. 1983. **Academic Strategy**. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kempner, Ken. 1991. "The Community College as a Marginalized Institution." Unpublished paper, presented at annual meeting of ASHE, Boston.

Kempner, Ken. 1991b. "Understanding Cultural Conflict," in W.G. Tierney (ed.), **Culture and Ideology in Higher Education**. New York: Praeger.

Kotler, Philip, and Patrick Murphy. 1981. "Strategic Planning for Higher Education." **The Journal of Higher Education**, 52 (5): 470-489.

Levin, John. 1994. Change and Influence in the Community College of British Columbia. **The Canadian Journal of Higher Education**, XXIV (1).

Levin, John. 1994b. "Power in the British Columbia Community College." **B. C. Studies**, forthcoming.

Levin, John. 1994c. "The Challenge of Leadership" In John D. Dennison (ed.), **Canada's Community Colleges in the Third Millennium**. Vancouver, B.C.: University of British Columbia Press.

Levin, John. 1993. Success Community College: An Examination of Organizational Change." Paper presented at the Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education Conference, Ottawa, Ontario.

Levin, John, and John Dennison. 1989. "Responsiveness and Renewal in Canada's Community Colleges: A Study of Organizations." **The Canadian Journal of Higher Education**, XIX (2): 41-57.

Levy, Amir and Uri Merry. 1986. **Organizational Transformation**. New York: Praeger.

McGrath, Dennis and Martin Spear. 1991. **The Academic Crisis of the Community College**. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Medsker, Leland. 1960. **The Junior College: Progress and Prospect**. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Merriam, Sharan. 1988 **Case Study Research in Education**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Mintzberg, Henry. 1983. **Power in and around Organizations**. Englewood Cliffs, N. J: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Mintzberg, Henry. 1989. **Mintzberg on Management: Inside Our Strange World of Organizations**. New York: The Free Press.

Morgan, Gareth. 1986. **Images of Organization**. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Nora, Amaury, L. Attinasi Jr., and Andrew Matonak. 1990. "Testing Qualitative Indicators of Precollege Factors in Tinto's Attrition Model: A Community College Student Population." **The Review of Higher Education**, 13 (3): 337-356.

Ouchi, William. 1981. **Theory Z: How American Business can Meet the Japanese Challenge**. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Owen, Starr. 1992. "An Interpretive Approach to Leadership: Developing a theme from a Case Study." In E. Miklos and E. Ratsoy (eds.), **Educational Leadership: Challenge and Change**. Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey. 1981. "Management as Symbolic Action: The Creation and Maintenance of Organizational Paradigms." **Research in Organizational Behavior**, 3, 1-52.

Raisman, Neal. 1990. "Moving into the Fifth Generation." **Community College Review**, 18 (2), 15-22.

Richardson, Jr., Richard. 1984. "Responsible Leadership: Tipping the Balance Toward Institutional Achievement." In John Roueche and George Baker III (eds.), **Community College Leadership for the '80s**. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Richardson, Jr., Richard, and Louis Bender. 1987. **Fostering Minority Access and Achievement in Higher Education**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Richardson, Jr., Richard, Elizabeth Fisk, and Morris Okum. 1983. **Literacy in the Open-Access College**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Roueche, John and George Baker III. 1987. **Access and Excellence**. Washington, D.C.: The Community College Press.

Roueche, John, George Baker III, and Robert Rose. 1989. **Shared Vision**. Washington, D.C.: The Community College Press.

Roueche, John and Suanne Roueche. 1993. **Between a Rock and a Hard Place: The At-Risk Student in the Open Door College**. Washington: The Community College Press.

Skolnik, Michael. 1988. "The Evolution of Relations Between Management and Faculty in Ontario Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology." **The Canadian Journal of Higher Education**, 28(3): 83-111.

Smircich, Linda, and Gareth Morgan. 1982. "Leadership: The Management of Meaning." **The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science**, 18(3): 257-273.

Tierney, William. 1988. **The Web of Leadership**. Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.

Tierney, William. 1993. **Building Communities of Difference: Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century**. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.

Tillery, Dale, and William Deegan. 1985. "The Evolution of Two-Year Colleges Through Four Generations." In William Deegan, Dale Tillery, and Associates(eds.), **Renewing The American Community College**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Tinto, Vincent. 1987. **Leaving College: Rethinking the Causes and Cures of Student Attrition**. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Torbert, William. 1991. **The Power of Balance: Transforming Self, Society, and Scientific Inquiry**. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Weick, Karl. 1976. "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems." **Administrative Science Quarterly**, 21: 1-19.

Yin, Robert. 1989. **Case Study Research**. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.